

THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY REPORTER.

UNDER THE SANCTION OF THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

LXXXVI. VOL. IV.—No. 7.]

LONDON: WEDNESDAY, APRIL 5TH, 1843.

[PRICE 4d.]

RESULTS OF EMANCIPATION IN THE BRITISH COLONIES.

THE ignorance, real or pretended, of parties, who, from their elevated position and the means they possess of exact information, might be expected to know that about which they venture an opinion, was never more strikingly exhibited than in a recent communication from M. Gonzalez, late Minister for Foreign Affairs in the Spanish Government, to Mr. Aston, the British Minister at the Court of Madrid.

It appears that Mr. Aston had been pressing upon the Spanish Government the necessity of complying with the just demands of this country for the faithful fulfilment of their treaties for the abolition of the slave-trade and the liberation from slavery of all negroes surreptitiously introduced into the Spanish Colonies since the year 1820, to both which acts they are solemnly bound, not less from a regard to their engagements with this country, than to give effect to laws enacted by themselves.

To the liberation of the slaves illicitly introduced, M. Gonzalez demurs, for the reasons set forth in the communication alluded to:

"It is necessary," he says, "to examine what would be the results to which emancipation would lead in Cuba; and they are not gratuitous suppositions, but real and effective facts, which the English nation can prove in their own colonies. The abundance in tropical countries, the few necessities of the African race, and their want of enlightenment, are the occasions that, if left to themselves, they become overwhelmed with sloth, indolence, and all the vices of their condition; thus bringing on society evils without number, as took place in Santo Domingo, and as now occur in Jamaica.

"In Jamaica the value of property fell 86 per cent. in consequence of the emancipation; the same result is experienced in the northern states with regard to those of the south of the American Union; and in vain are coercive laws appealed to for compelling the negroes to work, as neither the rural code of Santo Domingo, nor the law of the 17th September, 1838, in Jamaica, are sufficient to render the negroes laborious.

"Jamaica presents, besides the lamentable example of a reform executed out of time or season; and, without intending to censure the conduct followed in that formerly rich, and now unfortunate, island, the facts are so public, that they do not require commentaries. The slaves emancipated refuse to work; the proprietors emigrate by hundreds; the emigration of whites has produced no other effect than to consume infructuously the funds voted for that purpose; and matters have arrived at such a state, that Her Britannic Majesty's Government, the same who now demand the absolute emancipation in Cuba since 1820, have in February last authorized Mr. Barclay, a member of the Legislative Council of Jamaica, to convey thither from Sierra Leone thousands of negroes, who, under the denomination of forced labourers for fourteen or fifteen years, will be real slaves, torn from their native country, and carried to work in slavery, thus reproducing in 1840 those of *statu liberi* of the Romans; and in consequence of this authorization, the Royal Navy of England has already begun to convey negroes to Jamaica for a slavery, which, though temporary, is contrary to existing treaties.

"So that it appears from this that England retrogrades to slavery for the advantage of her colonies, under the title of engagement, or forced services, for the space of fourteen or fifteen years, the only path she has found for remedying the evils which emancipation has produced, and alleviating the immense losses of the proprietors of Jamaica, and notwithstanding all her resolutions with regard to the negroes. Such is the force of facts."

Such are the preposterously absurd statements of the Spanish Minister, in his letter to Mr. Aston of the 20th December, 1841, to which the attention of Lord Stanley was directed by the Earl of Aberdeen, with a request to be favoured with his lordship's observations thereon. These were forwarded to the noble Earl in a letter, dated the 2nd February, 1842, which has recently been laid before Parliament, and from which we propose to make some copious extracts. After recapitulating the statements of M. Gonzalez, Lord Stanley observes:—

"How far the present value of property in Jamaica may equal the value of the same property in former periods, is a question which cannot be categorically answered, being a matter of opinion and conjecture; but some light may be thrown upon it by what will be said presently. To the other statements of M. Gonzalez it is necessary to reply, that there are no laws coercive of labour in existence in Jamaica, or in any other British colony in the West Indies; that the proprietors do not emigrate; that no forced importations of negroes have been authorized, or have taken place, from Sierra Leone, or any other country, into Jamaica, or any other British colony; that since 1838 no forced labour has existed, or could exist, within any such colony; and that the British Navy has not been employed at all in any service connected with the conveyance of emigrants to the West Indies. With regard to the specification of 'the law of the 17th September, 1838, in Jamaica,' it is impossible to conjecture what law is meant. The Legislature of Jamaica did not sit beyond the month of June in that year.

"Her Majesty's Government regret to find that M. Gonzalez has been so much misinformed on these points; but it is not the fault of Her Majesty's Government that the Government of Spain is in this state of inform-

ation. It is impossible that information on a political question could have been more carefully collected, or more openly proffered to all those who desire to be correctly informed upon it, than the information which has been printed under the authority of Parliament, and abridged, printed, and published under the authority of Her Majesty's Government, on the establishment and working of the system of free labour in the West Indies.

"The Government of France, connected with this question by interests and responsibilities of less magnitude, though of the same nature with those of Spain, has taken pains to be informed upon it, and has presented to the Chambers of that country an elaborate 'Précis de l'Abolition de l'Esclavage dans les Colonies Anglaises,' in four printed volumes, tracing minutely the whole course of measures and events; and that Government has, moreover, sent commissioners to the several British colonies in the West Indies, to inquire into the results of the free-labour system, and the reports of those commissioners are contained in the fourth volume of the 'Précis.'

"Thus, if M. Gonzalez had desired to make himself acquainted with the state of the facts, there were ample means of information accessible to him; and if he distrusted the information supplied by the British Government (which, however, is far too extensive and minute to be the vehicle of any partial views), he might have had recourse to that collected by the French Government, standing to this question in the same position as his own.

"In order that Lord Aberdeen may be enabled to place the whole of this information still more within the reach of M. Gonzalez than it appears to have been hitherto, this letter is accompanied, 1st, by the whole of the papers laid before the British Parliament since 1833; 2nd, by the volume of extracts from some of those papers published by authority in 1840; 3rd, by a paper entitled 'Memorandum on the Progress of the Free System in the West India Colonies in 1840,' prepared in the Colonial Office, and printed for the information of the British Cabinet; 4th, by the latest reports from the stipendiary magistracy employed to superintend the system; and, 5th, by the four volumes containing the French Précis and reports.

"In these voluminous collections will be found the opinions and observations of persons of every class and party, of committees of planters, and of local assemblies representing the planting interest, as well as of Government functionaries, and of French authorities indisposed to an early emancipation, as well as English who are favourable to it. There will be found in them views widely differing on many points, statements opposed to each other, extreme and inconsistent opinions, and inferences from partial or mistaken observation. But there will also be found in them some unquestionable facts, and some broad results of the British emancipation, on which all men are agreed.

"1st. It will be found that the British emancipation took place without the occurrence of a single instance of tumult or disturbance, or employment of military force; and that the joy of the negroes on the 1st of August, 1838, was orderly, sober, and religious, and was manifested throughout the colonies by prayers and thanksgivings offered up in the churches.

"2nd. It will be found that the emancipation on the 1st of August, 1838, was absolute and unqualified; and that there does not exist in any colony a single law which makes any distinction between white men and black, or between black men coming from Sierra Leone or elsewhere and those who are natives of the West Indies.

"3rd. It will be found that since the emancipation the negroes have been thriving and contented; that they have raised their manner of living, and multiplied their comforts and enjoyments; that their offences against the laws have become more and more light and infrequent; that their morals have improved; that marriage has been more and more substituted for concubinage; and that they are eager for education, rapidly advancing in knowledge, and powerfully influenced by the ministers of religion.

"Such are amongst those results of the British emancipation which are plain and indisputable. And, before proceeding to the controverted questions of the amount of labour to be obtained from the negroes and the value of property, it is proper to observe, for the information of M. Gonzalez, that whatever may be the conclusions on those questions, the results which have been enumerated constitute, in the estimation of Her Majesty's Government and of the British people, the complete success of the British emancipation, in so far as relates to the primary and paramount objects of that Act. Those objects were to substitute, for a system which is contrary to justice and humanity, and repugnant to Christian principles, one which should render an oppressed and degraded portion of our fellow-creatures happy and contented, and raise them in the scale of society and of Christian life by protection and instruction, and the enjoyment of equal rights. It was no doubt of great importance that the further objects of agricultural and commercial prosperity should be also secured; but these objects, however important in themselves, were merely secondary to the others; and how little they were deemed to be worthy of being placed in comparison with them, is evinced by the preliminary grant of twenty millions sterling to the planters in compensation for such losses as they might be exposed to."

On the foregoing statements of the noble lord, we feel it our duty to make the following remarks—That, although "there does not exist in any colony a single law which makes any distinction between white men and black," there nevertheless are laws existing

in some of the colonies which bear oppressively on the labouring population, such as the law regulating the relation between master and servant in Antigua, and the law restrictive of a free circulation of labour throughout the West Indies, as that of Barbadoes; and that, subsequently to the period when his lordship penned this important letter, an ordinance has been enacted in Trinidad, which places the Africans introduced into that colony at the disposal of the Governor for a period of twelve months, during which time he has the power of apprenticing them to any planter he may select, on any terms he may choose. We trust, however, that so monstrous an infringement of the liberty of the imported African has been by this time disallowed by the Queen in Council. We would also observe, that it has not been without a considerable struggle, since the complete emancipation of the negroes in 1838, both on the part of the Government and people of this country, that the colonial legislatures have been induced to place the general laws of the colonies on a just and equitable basis; and that there is still a disposition manifested by some of them to interfere with the rights and privileges of the emancipated classes.

It was unnecessary, we think, for the noble lord to have fortified his positions by extracts from the reports of any gentleman deputed by the French Government to examine into the results of emancipation in the British colonies. Most of them were evidently opposed to the abolition of slavery under any circumstances, and eagerly picked up every scandalous report and base insinuation that the disappointment and prejudice which the worst portion of the quondam slaveholders could suggest or furnish them. We bring not this charge, however, against M. Layrle, though evidently an enemy of emancipation; but we wish his Lordship had quoted, in connexion with his diluted testimony in favour of free labour, the solid facts and reasonings of M. Jules Le Chevalier, another of the Commissioners.

The noble lord having disposed of the question submitted to him, so far as the liberated slaves are concerned, proceeds to notice briefly the alleged results of emancipation in reference to the planters. His Lordship says:—

"The experience of the British colonies, up to the present time, shows that in the majority of the British colonial possessions, the amount of exportable produce, resulting from the application of free labour, has suffered no inconsiderable diminution, as compared with that which was the product of forced labour under the former system of slavery; and it is probably true, also, that this reduced produce has been obtained by a higher expenditure, on the part of the planters, than that to which they were before subjected.

"Although this increased expenditure has been, in great measure, made up to the planters by the consequent increased price of colonial produce in the home market, under the existing scale of duties, and the loss has, therefore, in great measure, fallen upon the consumer, Her Majesty's Government are not insensible to the inconveniences which have resulted from this state of things; and are anxious, by the correction of this evil, to demonstrate to the world that the interests of religion, and justice, and humanity, can be reconciled with the inferior, but still important interests of commercial prosperity; and it is with this view that they have given, and will continue to give, every proper encouragement to those measures for the promotion of emigration to the West Indies, which M. Gonzalez has so singularly misconstrued."

This was his lordship's opinion in the early part of last year, and it became necessary that he should deal with the subject as he did, however much it might weaken his general argument, in order to make out a case in support of the scheme to promote emigration from Africa, which he then evidently contemplated. That the planters as a body have lost nothing by emancipation is clear from the following facts:—In addition to the twenty millions paid them in the shape of compensation, the money value of the produce shipped home during the first six years of freedom, dating from the 1st August, 1834, was greater than during the last six years of slavery, as may be seen from the following statement made by his lordship in the House of Commons on the 22nd March, 1842. He said, "The average value of sugar for the six years preceding the apprenticeship was 5,320,021*l.*, and that for the four years of the apprenticeship was 6,217,801*l.*; in the first year of freedom the amount was 5,530,000*l.*, and in the next year 5,424,000*l.*; and although this year there would be a large reduction, still there would be a fair remuneration for what was lost by the diminution of produce." On the latter point his lordship was mistaken, for so far from there having been a diminution of produce shipped to this country during the year 1842, it appears by the official statement recently laid before Parliament, it actually exceeded that of the preceding year by 328,215 cwts. of sugar, and 3,346,479 lbs. of coffee; and, we may add, that the prospects for the present year, as admitted by all the colonial papers, is more satisfactory still. For instance, the *Royal Gazette* of British Guiana predicts "that the exports of 1843 will exceed those of 1842 by 7,000 hogsheads of sugar." The *Jamaica Standard* states that "the crop for exportation will exceed 50,000 hogsheads, being an increase of 5,000 upon that of last year, and 20,000 upon that of the year preceding." The *Trinidad Standard* observes, "It is considered, that, should the crop season prove favourable, the island may ship an increase of 2,000 hogsheads over the quantity of last year. From the other sugar colonies, the reports are equally favourable, although we fear that some of the colonies, such as Antigua, St. Kitts, and Dominica, will not be able to gather in their fine crops, owing to the destructive nature of the earthquake, from which they have suffered, in common with other islands of the Antilles.

Such facts as these are surely sufficient to convince all impartial

persons, that so far from the abolition of slavery having proved a failure, it has been the reverse, except in the case of particular individuals, who, either from obstinacy, mismanagement, or inability, have not been able to compete with others more wise and just, or more favourably circumstanced than themselves.

We enter not into his lordship's defence of his scheme for promoting emigration from Africa to the British colonies; we think it, however, due to the friends of emancipation in this country to quote the following observation of his lordship on the salutary influence they have exercised, and still continue to exert, over measures affecting the freedom and welfare of the negro population in the British colonies:—

"In the case of these measures," says his lordship, "as in that of the measures for the emancipation of the negroes, all the proceedings of the Government may be known, from the papers which they have presented to Parliament, and which have been printed for the information of the public. A copy of those papers is enclosed herewith, for the information of M. Gonzalez.

"Much less information than those papers contain, and a very slender knowledge of the state of public feeling in this country and its influence over public measures, would have sufficed to show M. Gonzalez that the forced conveyance of negroes from Sierra Leone to the West Indies, and the forced labour which he supposes to have taken place, would have been as impossible as they would have been iniquitous and inconsistent with all that Great Britain has done on behalf of the negroes, and all the sacrifices she has made. These acts and sacrifices, and the spirit in which they were done and suffered, are notorious in every civilized region of the world, and therefore they cannot be unknown to the Government of Spain. The national feeling which prompted them is as strong now as it ever was, and the parties who are the representatives of that feeling in the country are not less vigilant, and were there to be the slightest attempt at encroachment on the freedom of the negro in any part of the British dominions, it would be exposed and resisted the instant that it was made."

It is due to the noble lord to quote the concluding remarks of his letter, in which, after repudiating the charges brought against the British Government by M. Gonzalez, he invites an investigation of the results of emancipation in the British colonies, and points out by implication the dishonourable course which the Spanish Government has followed upon the slave question:—

"The statements of M. Gonzalez," his lordship observes, "have now been as fully answered as it is possible that they should be, in the compass of a communication of this nature. But it may be desirable to invite M. Gonzalez to a careful examination of the documents accompanying this letter, by which he may possess himself of accurate information on a question deeply affecting the colonial dominions of Spain. Should the Government of her most Catholic Majesty be still distrustful of the information thus freely tendered, and desire to follow the example of the Government of France, by sending commissioners to the British colonies in the West Indies, to inquire into the results of the emancipation, I shall be happy to direct that all public documents which can be of assistance to them in their inquiry, shall be open to their inspection.

"In the mean time, I feel myself called upon not only to answer the statements of M. Gonzalez as they have been answered, but also to express my regret that such statements have been made. Respecting the commercial prosperity of the British West Indian colonies, we can have no right to complain of the expression of any opinion which M. Gonzalez may have formed, upon whatever data. But when M. Gonzalez charges the British Government with having caused thousands of negroes to be torn from their native country, and carried to work in slavery in the West Indies, I cannot withhold the expression of my deep regret that M. Gonzalez should have permitted himself, however strong may be his prepossession against the measure of emancipation, to hazard, in ignorance of the real facts of the case, and, as it has been shown, in direct contradiction to them, imputations upon the British Government, involving a violation of national honour and faith, and a participation in acts which, by whatever nation they are done or permitted to be done, are regarded in this country, and in the civilized world at large, with daily increasing abhorrence."

ACTIVITY OF THE SLAVE-TRADE IN CUBA.

We have been favoured with the following extract of a communication from the Havana, relative to the present state of the slave-trade in the island of Cuba, which we commend to the attention of our readers:—

"The slave-trade continues in the island of Cuba with the same activity which has characterized it for the last five years, with this difference, that the infractions of the treaty between Spain and Great Britain are not so glaringly committed as heretofore. A little more trouble is taken by all parties to cover their nefarious proceedings.

"On the 6th of January of the present year, the Portuguese brig *Roldan* arrived, bringing a small quantity of jerked beef, merely sufficient to cover the artillery she had on board concealed in her hold. The arrival of this vessel was not reported, as all other arrivals of vessels are. A very few days after her arrival, while she was yet lying at the wharf, with a large piece of jerked beef hanging at the end of her bowsprit, (the insignia of all jerk beef vessels,) it was discovered, through the means of a person belonging to the *Roldan*, that she had come from the coast of Africa with a cargo of 575 Bozal negroes. That she had succeeded in landing them safely at a place called La Chorrera, from whence they had been conducted to a neighbouring coffee plantation, and there distributed to their respective masters. At La Chorrera, the *Roldan's* artillery had been put in the hold near to the keel, under a floor made expressly for the purpose, and a few hundred arrobas of jerked beef had been taken on board at *La Chorrera*, with which cargo she arrived at the Havana with impunity. This

vessel, the *Roldan*, has changed her Portuguese for the Spanish flag, and is now called *El Ultimo*.

"On the 8th February, the brigantine *Jacinto*, under the Portuguese flag, belonging to the notorious slave-trader, Forcade, sailed from this port, (the sailing of this vessel was not reported either,) and proceeded direct to Bahia-honda, where she came to anchor. On the evening of the 10th of the same month, considerably after sunset, a small schooner, which was originally a large lighter, built within the last few months, and which, until within a few days previous to the 10th, when a deck and the rig of a schooner were put upon her, had been lying unemployed at the wharf of Juan Vives, on the other side of the harbour, sailed for Bahia-honda, having on board fifteen men belonging to the *Jacinto*, and deeply laden with goods for the coast of Africa trade. This brigantine, the *Jacinto*, when fitting out at the wharf of Casa Blanca, had been accused of being engaged in the slave-trade, (report says, the accusation was made by the Consul-General,) the consequence was, that, by order of the Captain-General, she had been removed from Casa Blanca, and anchored close under the guns of a Spanish ship of war. This hypocritical formality having been enacted, after the expiration of a few days she was released for want of proof, and while lying almost alongside of the ship of war, two large lighters, belonging to *Regla*, were engaged for several successive nights, during the whole night through, until towards the dawn of day, in carrying goods, and other effects, including arms and ammunition, on board the *Jacinto*. In this way the *Jacinto* was got ready for sea, and with the assistance of the schooner, *alias* the lighter, which carried to her at Bahia-honda the residue of her crew and the remainder of her cargo, she was enabled to proceed to the coast of Africa; and no doubt within three or four months she will be back here again, with 300 or 400 victims on board. How long is this to last? How the little schooner, *alias* the lighter, could have gone to sea after sunset, the harbour-master, no doubt, will be best able to explain. The regulations of the port strictly forbid the sailing of any vessel after sunset.

"Garcia Oña, the Governor of Matanzas, protects the slave-trade as much as ever it was protected. There are several slavers which have lately sailed from Matanzas for the coast of Africa; among the number, a beautiful fast-sailing Spanish barque, the name of which has not been ascertained. Besides which, we are informed that successful landings of Africans at St. Jago de Cuba, Trinidad, and other out-ports of the island, take place weekly. A consul at Matanzas, with instructions to watch over the infractions of existing treaties, who would dare to do his duty in the face of danger, would tend to produce a great deal of good. To the friends of African freedom it is truly distressing to witness all these proceedings, and not be able to crush the wretches who protect and tolerate them. But to an Englishman, who has at heart the honour and integrity of his country, it must be mortifying in the extreme, to see the apathy and shameful indifference of the British members of the Court of Mixed Commission, who neither know (*without being constantly informed*) nor seem to care a farthing about the diabolical proceedings which are going on under their very noses. The one lives about two leagues in the country, where his whole time is occupied in the study of ornithology; and the other, *poor man*, is too simple to do good, and too innocent to do harm.

"Report says that the Consul-General has been instructed by his Government not to interfere in a direct manner with the infractions of the treaty, because it is a duty incumbent solely on the British Commissioners, the possessors of a sinecure of 1,600*l.* sterling per annum, and a free house; and God knows, with the exception of this petty duty, which they so shamefully neglect, their appointment is a most perfect sinecure. If it be true that the Consul-General has been instructed not to interfere directly with the infractions of the slave-trade treaty, it will be a great misfortune, because he is said to be, by those who know him, a man honest in principle, of great firmness of character, and, in every sense, a most determined friend to African freedom.

"A doctor, resident in Puerto Principe, named Don Francisco Agüero, has become suddenly a convert to the cause of humanity. He was the possessor of eighteen slaves, and he has given them all their freedom on the same day, declaring that no man professing the Christian religion ought to be the holder of a slave. This circumstance has caused great excitement in Puerto Principe."

EXTENSION OF SUGAR CULTIVATION IN BRITISH INDIA.

THE cultivation of sugar in British India is rapidly increasing. In 1832, the quantity imported into Great Britain from that part of the empire, was about 3,800 tons; but then it had to contend with a differential duty of eight shillings per cwt., in favour of the West Indies. Since 1836, when the duties were equalized, the increase has been prodigious. The year before last the quantity imported was above 62,000 tons; and now that the duties on rum, as well as sugar, from the East and West Indies, have been placed on the same footing, there can be no doubt that a much larger quantity will be imported, if the wants of the British market require it.

We give below an extract from the *Maulmain Chronicle*, of the 30th November last, on the anticipated rapid extension of sugar cultivation in the Tennesseim provinces. The article will speak for itself. Our principal object in drawing attention to it is, to remind our readers that a system of slavery exists there, which, however modified by the regulations of the

East India Company in 1831, will not fail to degenerate into a bondage of the worst kind if not immediately terminated. As it is of the nature of laws not based in justice, however they may be guarded, to become bad in practice, we earnestly hope that no time will be lost by the Indian Government in terminating the system of debtor-slavery which so universally prevails in these provinces.

The bonds under which the slaves were held under the Birman Empire were various, whether for general service, for domestic service, or for agricultural purposes. They generally involved the payment of an enormous rate of interest, on liquidating which, together with the original debt, the slave became free. This, however, was rarely done; the debts being augmented by the master on account of the slave, for clothes and other items. The debts originally contracted, with their augmentation, and the interest which accrued on them, descended to the free-born children; and they were compelled to discharge them, either by payment of the money, or by the substitution of their persons. Children born whilst their parents were in bondage, became the slaves of the creditor; and were not released by the payment of the original debt of the parents. In satisfaction of a debt, parents could sell their children, husbands their wives, and heads of families their dependent relatives. The amount for which they were sold was considered their debt, for which they were held accountable; and until it was paid to the creditor, they and their posterity continued his bond-servants. On becoming a slave for a certain amount, it was a usual custom to provide security, and such security was made answerable, not only in the case of the slave absconding, but even on his death. These securities were generally the relations of the slaves. It is easy to perceive how such a system of bond-service might become hereditary slavery, as in fact it did; and such we found it when these provinces fell into our hands.

Under British sway, debtor-slavery is still permitted, provided the slave be sixteen years of age when he enters into the engagement, and the slave-bond be duly registered before the authorities. Parents are not now allowed to mortgage the labour of their children; but if they die in slavery, their masters are entitled to hold their children until they arrive at the age of sixteen, "as a recompense," it is said, "for the expense incurred in their maintenance." These are important modifications, we admit, but still they only require management on the part of the masters, to make the bondage as oppressive and severe, as that which formerly obtained under the Birman laws.

We believe it is left to the discretion of the authorities in the Tennesseim provinces to terminate this species of bondage altogether. Let its abolition be made imperative; and a contract law, similar to that which is now in operation in the Crown colonies of the West Indies, be substituted for it, and we shall be satisfied.

The editor of the *Maulmain Chronicle*, we regret to perceive, is not opposed to the system of bondage which prevails around him. He can see "no reasonable ground of objection to it," and in the true spirit of the old pro-slavery party of this country, advises the Christian to let the "patriarchal institution" alone. We are glad, however, to perceive that, in his opinion, neither this, nor any other system of oppression in British India, will be allowed to continue much longer. "Fortunately," he observes, "for the sympathies of the good people at home this system of slavery cannot last. The progress of knowledge and legislative enactments will gradually remove the evil." Be ours the duty to hasten the progress of those measures which shall "bring about a proper state of civil relationship among the natives of India;" and to establish their liberties on a just and permanent basis. We take in good part the advice of our contemporary, to be mindful of home affairs; and invite his co-operation in removing every vestige of oppression from every part of the British dominions:—

MAULMAIN.—By a resolution of the Honourable the President in Council, of the 21st of October, 1842, the permission to import sugar, both of foreign and British, into the settlements on the Tennesseim coast is rescinded. This proceeding is hailed by the Editor of the *Maulmain Chronicle* with high satisfaction, as eminently calculated to benefit these provinces, "both in a commercial and agricultural point of view." Already it appears the cultivation of sugar has been carried on successfully "on a large scale," and speaking of the enterprise of the individuals engaged in the adventure, and of the resources of the country, the Editor presents us with the following information:—"They (the sugar growers) have proved by their operations, now extending through several years, not only that the cane thrives here, but that it does so most luxuriantly, that the indigenous cane of the country is of admirable quality, that the sugar produced from it is equal to the very best manufactured in Bengal, and that with encouragement there can be no limit to the extension of the cultivation. Thousands upon thousands of acres of land require only to be cleared of its present superfluous jungle, and with little extra labour may be made to produce luxuriant crops of cane. Each province is admirably adapted to the cultivation. Successful as it has proved at Amherst, probably the southern provinces offer still greater advantages, both in richer soil and in more equable diffusion of rain throughout the year. The superficial extent of these provinces is estimated at 30,000 square miles, and we hesitate not to say that at the very least one half is land admirably adapted to sugar cultivation, land not already under cultivation, and therefore requiring to be purchased from its proprietors, but a rich virgin soil, requiring only the application of labour to be converted into the most noble and profitable estates. We are in no way desirous that the difficulties attendant on such undertakings should be kept in the back ground. They are numerous, though, perhaps, less so than in any other part of India. Labour is scarce, and what is to be had is of very inferior quality; but labour may be imported to any extent and under any system of management of an estate. The country is densely covered with jungle; the labour of clearing it will be immense, and it

may be difficult to keep it clear with such a rank and luxuriant vegetation as obtains here during the wet season; but on the other hand, the climate has proved itself to be most admirably adapted to the European constitution, and land once planted with cane will not of itself revert to jungle. The scarcity, badness, and dearth of labour is, however, the grand obstacle; but great as it is, when we consider the facility of bringing labourers into these provinces, in which, being part and parcel of one of the Governments of India, the grand question of 'emigration of coolies' can never be mooted, this obstacle will be fully outweighed by numerous attendant advantages." In conclusion, he remarks:—"We are already enabled to point to results. A large extent of land is under cultivation, a factory has been established, the sugar made has been pronounced by competent judges to be equal to any made in India, and the notification of Government now insures a ready sale for the produce."—November 30, 1842.

NOTICES.

THE ANTI-SLAVERY REPORTER is an Evening Paper, published on alternate Wednesdays, and may be had of all News-vendors throughout the country. Price 4d., or 8s. 8d. per annum.

AT a GENERAL MEETING of the COMMITTEE of the BRITISH and FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, held at 27, New Broad-street, London, on Friday, the 31st March, 1843,

JACOB POST, Esq., in the Chair,

It was unanimously resolved,

That whilst this Committee deeply deplore the continuance of the African slave-trade with Brazil, the Spanish colonies, and other slave-holding countries, they especially lament the fact, that any British subjects should give it their countenance and support by mercantile transactions, and by the investment of capital in mines and plantations worked by slaves in foreign countries; and would trust that the measure for the more effectual suppression of this atrocious crime, of which notice has been given by the Right Hon. Lord Brougham, will be sufficiently comprehensive and stringent to accomplish this important end.

That this Committee feel it to be their duty to record their gratitude to the Right Hon. Lord John Russell for the appointment, when in office, of a Commission of Inquiry into the alleged practice of British subjects aiding and abetting the slave-trade on the western coast of Africa, and of their participating in the system of slavery said to exist there; and for the avowed purpose of his lordship to employ the powers vested in the Government for terminating these nefarious and unlawful proceedings.

That this Committee tender to R. R. Madden, Esq., M.D., Her Majesty's late Commissioner on the Western Coast of Africa, their cordial thanks for the zeal and ability with which he discharged the duties confided to him, and for the fearless and impartial manner in which he has exposed the evils connected with British participation in the "Slave-trade and the Pawn system." They would, further, express their deep regret that any portions of his valuable Report should have been withheld by the Government from the British public, and their warm sympathy with him under the unjust attacks to which he has been subjected by parties implicated in the transactions exposed, and which he has so successfully repelled.

JOHN SCOBLE, Secretary.

ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.

THE arrangements for the second general Anti-Slavery Convention are now complete. The venerable THOMAS CLARKSON has accepted the unanimous and cordial invitation of the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, to be its President. Freemasons' Hall has been secured for its sittings. The meetings of the delegates for business will commence on Tuesday, the 13th June next, at ten o'clock in the morning, and be continued from day to day (Sunday excepted) until it is closed. On Wednesday, the 21st June, the fourth Anniversary of the British and Foreign Society will be held at Exeter Hall, as an appropriate termination of the proceedings of the Convention, when the friends of the anti-slavery cause from various countries will have a public opportunity of bearing their united testimony against the continuance of slavery and the slave-trade.

We are much gratified in being able to state, that delegates representing the Anti-Slavery Societies existing in Edinburgh, Birmingham, Bath, Bristol, Gloucester, Derby, Exeter, Southampton, Rochester, Chatham and Strood, Norwich, Worcester, Hitchin, Woodbridge, Wellingborough, Cirencester, Kingsbridge, and Liskeard, have been already appointed; and the friends of the cause in other cities and towns in Great Britain and Ireland are respectfully requested to forward to the Secretary of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, No. 27, New Broad-street, lists of delegates appointed at their earliest convenience.

The Anti-Slavery Reporter.

LONDON, APRIL 5, 1843.

WE call the attention of our readers to the intelligence under the head of British India, where they will find that Coolie emigration has begun under the direction of some mercantile firms in Calcutta, and that one of the first vessels employed has been detected in a nefarious attempt to violate the laws in force. The facts brought to light, have, we learn from another source, determined the friends of the Indians, to hold a public meeting in Calcutta, for the purpose of denouncing the new scheme, under which crimping and kidnap-

ping, for the benefit of the Mauritius planters, had been vigorously prosecuted. We trust our friends in Calcutta will furnish us with early and authentic information of their proceedings.

THE late Colonial mail has brought us the usual files of papers to the 4th ult., but they are entirely barren of interest, if we except additional details respecting the late fearful earthquake which has visited the West Indies. Guadeloupe has suffered a much larger loss of life than was supposed, the number who have perished being variously reckoned from 3,200 to 6,000 persons. Of these several hundreds are represented to have been destroyed in the ruins from which they could not extricate themselves or be rescued by others, from the fires which broke out after the earthquake. We are happy to perceive that most of the colonies who have either suffered but little or not at all, by the event, are affording aid to those islands which have suffered most from the dreadful visitation.

IN another place will be found an extract from the *Colonial Gazette*, relating to a project for peopling the Brazils with Africans, under the name of colonists, who are to be declared free, with a view to supersede the necessity for the continuance of the slave-trade. This is an imitation of the scheme of Lord Stanley for peopling the West Indies with African labourers; with this difference, however, that the Brazilian project provides for the purchase, by barter, of Africans, held in captivity and sold as goods; whilst the scheme of the noble lord, of course, forbids this species of slave-trading. In adverting to this project, our contemporary observes:—"That some such measure would one day be adopted by Brazil, we have expressed our conviction; but there is a doubtful appearance about this one, which makes it desirable for the British Government and the friends of Free African Emigration to watch it well. If it is conceived *bona fide*, the Brazilian legislators cannot take offence at the pointing out of dangerous features. If it is an evasion of the restrictions on the slave-trade, by adopting the name of free emigration without its substance, it might bring a discredit on the real measure, highly serviceable to those who are conservative of the slave-trade."

There will be no difficulty whatever in dealing with this project under the slave-trade treaties, which at present exist between this country and Brazil; but it may be made to wear an aspect, by striking out all reference to the purchase of negroes in Africa, which will render it more difficult to deal with; for if England goes to Africa for *free* labourers, what is to prevent Brazil or Spain doing the same, though they may be covertly bought there, and merge into the slave populations of these countries on arrival?

THE news from the United States is unsatisfactory. It is evident the Government of that country interprets the eighth article of the Washington Treaty differently from the British Government. The former conceive it to be tantamount to the abandonment of the right of visit, claimed for its vessels on the high seas by the latter; whilst the latter contends that it never meant it to be so construed, and will not abandon a right which it has always exercised, and which it will continue to perform whenever occasion may require it. As applied to slave-trading, the "right of visit" can only affect vessels surreptitiously hoisting the American flag to cover its illegal practices. An American vessel, the property of American citizens, covered by the national flag, may traverse the ocean loaded with slaves without being delayed on her voyage by a British cruiser longer than may be necessary to ascertain her real character. Under the eighth article of the Treaty referred to, the two powers agree to keep on the coast of Africa "a naval force of vessels, of suitable numbers and description, to carry in all not less than 80 guns, to enforce separately and respectively the laws, rights, and obligations of each of these two countries, for the suppression of the slave-trade; the said squadrons to be independent of each other, but the two Governments stipulating, nevertheless, to give such orders to the officers commanding their respective forces as shall enable them most effectually to act in concert and co-operation, upon mutual consultation, as exigencies may arise, for the attainment of the true object of this article." To us it appears that such arrangements as these can never effect the object in view, which is the suppression by force of the slave-trade. It may check, but it can never subdue that evil whilst a slave-market remains open for the sale and purchase of human beings.

On Friday evening next this subject will be brought under the attention of the House of Lords by Lord Brougham; and under that of the Commons by Mr. Hume, when we suppose the whole subject will be thoroughly canvassed; we shall, therefore, reserve any further remarks we may have to make on the subject until the debates in both Houses of Parliament shall have taken place.

OUR Parliamentary intelligence will show that several points of great interest, connected with the anti-slavery cause, were canvassed in the recent debate on the Washington Treaty in the House of Commons. Considering the importance of the topics embraced in the discussion, as well as the position of the parties who joined in it, we have given it as full as possible for the general information of our friends.

We call the attention, however, of our readers to this debate, not for the purpose of mooted a discussion on the several points brought under review, but to induce the friends of freedom to watch vigilantly the progress of the Bill when it shall be introduced into Parliament, for giving effect to the article for the mutual extradition of criminals. Already have we given at length our views of the uses that will

be made of it by unprincipled slaveholders in the United States, for the recovery of fugitive slaves who have sought an asylum from bondage and oppression within the British territories—already have we contrasted it with the more simple and enlightened stipulations of the Convention negotiated with the French Government for a similar purpose—already have we pointed out its retrospective character, which renders insecure the position of thousands of the coloured race in Upper Canada,—and it now only remains for us to notice the fact, that, if the British Legislature and Government do not substantially adopt the recommendations suggested by the Committee of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, the injury they will inflict on the cause of human liberty and happiness will be incalculable.

It affords us much pleasure to find that the friends of the anti-slavery cause generally are nobly doing their duty in this matter, both by petitioning Parliament, and by calling upon their representatives to give their decided opposition to the extradition article, unless it be so modified as entirely to prevent the evils dreaded to result from it.

Parliamentary Intelligence.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.—March 21.

WASHINGTON TREATY.

RIGHT OF SEARCH—EXTRADITION OF CRIMINALS, &c.

LORD PALMERSTON then came to another part of the treaty, which related to another question, still more interesting than even that part of the cession of territory, because it was a question which involved very great principles and interests, and which were not confined simply to a province or nation, but were nearly connected with the best interests and feelings of the whole human race. He was now speaking of the article that related to the suppression of the slave-trade. It appeared to him that since the present Government had come into office, they had been making very great strides backwards with regard to every thing relating to slavery, and the suppression of the slave-trade. One, although not the first great stride, was that article in the treaty in which they accepted formally from the United States a most inadequate, incomplete (and he would not add, valueless) engagement, in lieu of that full and complete fulfilment of the article in the treaty of Ghent, by which the American Government bound themselves, that, whereas slavery was incompatible with the best interests of humanity, and being desirous of promoting its abolition, it was thereby agreed between both the contracting parties that they should use their best endeavours to accomplish so desirable an object. By the article in the boundary treaty they had formally accepted that inadequate measure as the fulfilment of these obligations, to which they were previously pledged to use their best exertions. The first step backwards the present Government had made, was the refusal of the French Government to ratify the treaty of December, 1841, which had been concluded between France, England, Austria, Russia, and Prussia. The history of that treaty was very well known to every body in that country, and was shortly as follows:—In 1831 and 1833 the British Government concluded with France treaties for the mutual right of search and the abolition of slavery. It was always known and admitted that the mutual right of search was indispensable for the suppression of the slave-trade. So long as slavery continued to exist in any country whatever, they would have endeavours to carry it on; and nothing would put an end to it effectually but the extinction of the condition of slavery: but even with the continuance of the condition, they might narrow, or put an end to the trade by an adequate police exercised upon the sea. That could not be without a mutual right of search, and that right of search would be insufficient and inutile until every power should have made formal treaties by which that right was conceded. And of this they might be satisfied, that in every country in which a clamour was raised against the concession of a mutual right of search,—they might rely upon it as a fact, that, at the bottom of that clamour, they would find some slave-holding or slave-trading interest. (Hear, hear.) The late Government had felt the importance of getting all the powers of Christendom to unite for that purpose, and with that object they addressed themselves, on coming into office, to France. France agreed with them; and in 1831 and 1833, greatly to the honour of both countries, a treaty was entered into, the result of which was the immediate suppression of slavery as regarded the trading under the French flag. France then proposed to Russia, Prussia, and Austria to become parties to that treaty; and these countries, having no slave-trading of their own, being swayed by no sinister influence, complied; but, as a matter of etiquette, they said they would conclude a new treaty to the same effect, but they did not think it consistent with etiquette to become consenting parties to a treaty which had been made without them. That being so, the English Government thought it a good opportunity to make some small improvement in the treaty, the geographical limits of the existing one being too much confined for general application, although quite sufficient, so far as France was concerned; but larger limits were then desirable. They proposed to the French Government that the new treaty should contain larger geographical limits, the principles being precisely the same as the former one. There was a good deal of negotiation on the subject, and at last they all came pretty nearly to an understanding, and then arose that unfortunate difference which was created between the French Government and the other three powers connected with the treaty of the 15th July, 1840, with regard to the operations in Syria. So long as that continued, they did not ask the French Government to conclude the right of search treaty. On the 13th July, 1841, France concluded with England, Austria, Russia, Prussia, and Turkey, that was to say, the five powers who had been negotiating the treaty in the preceding year—France concluded with these powers the treaty of the Dardanelles. That was a treaty of much political importance, and it was then peculiarly so, as being a public recognition of France acting in concert with the other four powers, with whom she had differed on the subject of Syria. Before the French plenipotentiary had left the room, he (Lord Palmerston) asked him if he was ready to sign the other treaty, which had been for some time ready. He said his authority only extended to signing the treaty of the Dardanelles, but he

was not prepared to sign the right of search treaty until he had applied to his Government for specific authority. The answer, when it came, was to the effect that the French Government had referred the treaty to the marine department, as there were several matters of routine and form to be taken into consideration, and that some weeks would elapse before these forms could be gone through. They soon found that that was a civil way of declining to sign the treaty at that particular time. They saw that it was intended to reserve it as a compliment to their successors, who were expected soon to come into office; and that had since been confirmed by the official declaration of the French Government, that they had withheld from the plenipotentiary their authority to sign the treaty from personal feeling towards the Ministry who had concluded the treaty of July, 1840. It was always to be regretted when personal feeling was permitted to sway national affairs, and he thought the French Government must have since seen, that if they had not given way to personal feeling on that occasion, they would have avoided the embarrassment that subsequently occurred; because, if the treaty had been concluded, and the ratifications exchanged in two months afterwards, it would have been arranged long before the French chambers met, and before parliamentary opposition had been raised to its ratification. That was the more to be regretted, because that personal feeling had prevented them from concluding a treaty, having no object but the advancement of the interests of humanity, and the extinction of a great crime; and although they had refused from that feeling to sign the right of search treaty, they did not allow these feelings to prevent them signing the political one, although in point of character, whatever its importance might be, it stood upon much lower grounds. The late Government of course acquiesced. All they wished was to have the treaty concluded; they would have been glad to have been able to say that it had been concluded in their time, but they were rejoiced that it was settled at any time. They took it for granted that it would be settled a very short time after their successors came into office. He certainly expected that the treaty would have been signed in the month of September or October, and he was much astonished to find, when a copy of the treaty had been laid upon the table of the house, that it had not been signed until the month of December following. He (Lord Palmerston) knew well how overwhelming were the duties of the Foreign-office, and more especially after a new Government came into power, and therefore it was no part of his duty to attach any blame to the Government. But even if the case was clear, the fault might have been elsewhere, and even assuming it to arise from oversight on the part of Her Majesty's Government, he should be rather disinclined to lay that to their charge as a ground of blame, more especially as it was impossible that they could suppose that the treaty, when signed, would not be ratified by all the parties. The treaty not having been signed before the month of December, the two months allowed for the ratification had not expired, when was created that clamour avowedly very much excited by the exertions of the American Minister—(hear, hear)—then arose that clamour which ended in the circumstances upon which France founded her refusal to sign that treaty. What were these circumstances? An address on the part of the chambers, not praying the Crown to withhold its ratification of the treaty, but that in its execution the Crown should take good care of the rights and interests of French subjects. But the treaty could not be executed until it had been first ratified; and that address could not, he submitted, be taken as a sufficient ground for a refusal to ratify. He was told that the English Government had made no remonstrance; and if they were satisfied that France had good grounds for her refusal, he (Lord Palmerston) could not set up his opinion against theirs. He could not, however, help taking notice of the new doctrine of international law promulgated by France. It was said that the Sovereign was not bound to ratify a treaty, if his plenipotentiary had signed it by his authority, if he saw reasons arising out of the interests of his subjects to withhold his ratification; and it was said that the example of the King of the Netherlands and the King of Prussia was a case in point. Now he (Lord Palmerston) could not admit that doctrine. As far as he knew, the writers on the law of nations said that there were but two grounds on which the Sovereign could refuse to ratify. One ground was, where the plenipotentiary acted without instructions, and the other was, where he acted against or beyond his instructions. Neither of these grounds was consistent with the present case. And, with regard to the Kings of the Netherlands and Prussia, the French Government was mistaken in supposing that that treaty was not ratified: he had been informed from the very best authority, that, although the King of the Netherlands did, in the first instance, demur, on the ground that the interests of his Luxemburg subjects would be injuriously affected, yet he did afterwards ratify it, without any change or modification. Therefore, he did not think the doctrine a good or a sound one, and the example cited did not bear it out. Well, he repeated, that the refusal of France to ratify that treaty was a great step backwards in the suppression of the slave-trade. What were their further intentions with regard to that treaty? The American Government had, for many years past, refused to agree to a mutual right of search. There was a time, in 1824, when they had pressed that question upon France and England, and a treaty had been actually concluded with England to that effect; and it was well known that the ratification was refused only because the Americans had annexed to it a limitation as to the coast of America, which would, to a great extent, defeat the object of the treaty. Perhaps it was unfortunate that they had not got over that difficulty; but, as it was, up to that time they were anxious to conclude a treaty with England which should carry out the obligations they had undertaken by the treaty of Ghent. Latterly, the great exertions that had been made in that country, and the prospect of the abolition of slavery in these colonies, had created great alarm in America, among the slaveholders. Public opinion had taken a strong turn among the people of the United States, and the right of search was then strenuously opposed by them. But the former Government had hoped that, if England, France, Russia, Austria, and Prussia—when the five greatest powers in Europe, including, he might say, the three greatest maritime powers in the world—agreed to the right of search; if they were able to go to the United States, and to say, "We have cast into oblivion all our separate interests and differences,—we have laid aside all petty and paltry jealousies of each other's rights,—we have agreed upon one great object, to give each other a mutual right of search—for Heaven's sake come and join us, and do what you were willing to do in 1824,"—they hoped that, if the five powers

had been in a condition to go to the United States with such an address, not only that it must have been entirely successful, but that it must have had great weight with the world, and with the Americans themselves. And the Americans saw this, and General Cass saw it; and it was in consequence of the effect which such an event would produce that he made those efforts which ended in the defeat of the ratification of the treaty. Now that was one step backwards in reference to the suppression of the slave-trade. The next step backwards was the conclusion of this treaty; because, say as you would that it was not recorded that this was accepted as a full and complete fulfilment of engagements entered into by the United States Government in the treaty of Ghent, still the world looked upon it in that light, and France so regarded it. France argued, "If England is satisfied with so small a concession from America, in pursuance of her engagements to put an end to the slave-trade, why should we not be placed in the same position? Why should we be called upon to exhibit our flag, and be subjected to all the vexation and annoyance which a right of search entails, while the Americans, by being more obstinate, and refusing with greater perseverance, are placed upon a different footing?" He therefore said, that the effect of the treaty was, not only to give encouragement to the Americans in the refusal of the right of search, but they placed in danger the treaty with France for the suppression of the slave-trade, and the effectual extinction of slavery. Another step backwards was the letter written by the Secretary for Foreign Affairs to the Lords of the Admiralty, with regard to the existence of slave-trading factories in native states on the coast of Africa. It was well known that the way in which the slave-trade was carried on there was, that the Spanish and Portuguese and Brazilian slave-dealers, settled not in any European colony, but in a district of territory belonging to some native chief,—there they built what they called a barracoon, but which was in reality a fortress; for they armed it with cannon, and garrisoned it with men provided with fire-arms. They thus overawed the natives, and derived all the benefits that could be drawn from such a traffic. The best mode—at least one of the best modes of destroying these piratical states, was that which had been resorted to in the first instance by Lieutenant Denman, greatly to his honour and the advantage of humanity, and which, without any previous instructions from the Government, received their subsequent approbation, Lieutenant Denman being promoted as a reward for his zealous exertions. After that the same measures were adopted in other cases, and it was understood that a similar course should be adopted wherever it could; but what was the way in which that should be done? Here were these barracoons, how were they employed? A slave-trader sent a ship laden with those commodities, which were exchanged for slaves to the place where the barracoon was situated. Agents appointed for the purpose collected the negroes by hundreds, and in some instances by thousands, to have them ready to embark. The ship arrived at the port, unloaded her cargo of Peruvian bark, which was stowed away in the warehouses, and took aboard the cargo of negroes, who were stowed away in the hold, and away she went. A few hours were sufficient to complete the process, and the vessel had great facilities for escaping our cruisers. The plan adopted was to enter into an understanding with the native chief who permitted us to burn the barracoon and carry off the negroes—the natives being suffered to carry away the merchandise. With these arrangements, all parties, except the slave-trader, were perfectly content. The native chiefs being gratified with getting the Peruvian bark, and the negroes of course enchanted at obtaining their liberty. The letter written by the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, which was generally understood by the world as implying a condemnation of this course of proceeding, and a forbidding of its repetition in future, he did not so read it, because, although at first it might have that appearance, yet, so far as he understood the letter, it did not appear to him to rescind the instructions which had been before issued. But the impression raised by it was, that it was a blaming of the proceedings which had before taken place and a forbidding of their future repetition; and therefore he said it certainly was a great encouragement to the slave-trade; and he should like to know from Her Majesty's Government, whether he or the public at large put the correct construction upon the letter of the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, and whether they intended to prevent these proceedings in future, or to allow them to be carried into effect? He had said that these were great steps backward as regarded the suppression of slavery, and it was with great regret he had seen them. Another step backward was the 10th article of this treaty, which had also been taken up by some of those most zealous in their desire for the suppression of the slave-trade, as opposing an obstacle not only to the suppression of the slave-trade, but to the liberation of slaves who might escape from the United States. It was supposed by many that this 10th article, by the arrangement to deliver up persons who should be accused of robbery in the United States, would open a door to the surrender of fugitive slaves who might be accused by their masters frivolously of stealing their apparel or the means of conveyance which they might have chosen, or be falsely accused on false affidavits of some other robbery of which they might be entirely innocent. He confessed he did not share in these apprehensions, as he was convinced Her Majesty's Government would have so ordered matters that such abuses could not take place; but it would be gratifying to the House to hear from the Government that the subject had not escaped their attention, and that provision had been made to prevent such a gross abuse of a regulation which was in other respects advantageous. He said, then, that there were steps which had been taken which tended to throw us back with regard to the suppression of slavery; and he could not, on this occasion, help advert to a part of the correspondence on the table, between Lord Ashburton and Mr. Webster, on that subject. The correspondence was connected with the case of the slave ship the *Creole*. In that correspondence, Mr. Webster laid down the doctrine that whenever an American vessel entered a British port the slaves aboard were the property of the owners, and that a British court had no right to interfere or exercise any jurisdiction with reference to such property, and he called upon Lord Ashburton to enter into some engagement, on the part of the British Government, that the officious interference of the British colonial authorities with American cargoes of slaves should not be allowed to continue with respect to American vessels driven by stress of weather into British ports. And he was sorry to say that Lord Ashburton, in his reply, appeared to give too much countenance

to the doctrine laid down by Mr. Webster, and did enter into an engagement, on the part of his Government, that such officious interference should for the future not take place. He thought that, in this instance, Lord Ashburton was not sufficiently acquainted with what had passed on similar subjects between the British and American Governments, and was not sufficiently mindful of the law of England in the matter with which he was dealing. He allowed himself to be led by Mr. Webster to treat upon the ground that negroes were the property of American owners in British ports as in American territories, and that it would be an injustice for which compensation might be claimed if, by the operation of British law, they were restored to liberty, and withdrawn from the possession of the American owners. Although the correspondence had reference to the case of the *Creole*, which had occurred but recently, he would remind the House that there were papers on the table of the House; and gentlemen who took the trouble to refer to the votes of 1839 would find his assertion confirmed, which would show that this was not a new question. In February, 1835, the American ship *Enterprise* was driven by stress of weather into a port of Bermuda, and being there with a cargo of slaves aboard, the authorities of the colony interfered. He did not know whether they took the step of their own motion, or whether they were called upon by any parties to do so, but by the application of British law (slavery being then abolished and prohibited in the British colonies as well as in the British empire at home) they set free the slaves, took them away from the illegal custody of American owners on board a ship in a British port, and set them free. For this the American Government made a demand of compensation, and they also demanded compensation in the cases of the *Encomium* and the *Comet*, which in preceding years had been wrecked on the Bahamas, and the slaves carried by wreckers to Nassau, and afterwards set free. But what was the answer of the British Government? It was, that in the two first cases the law of slavery existed at that time in our own colonies as well as in the United States; that the Americans had come within our jurisdiction, and that the slaves, of whom they were lawfully possessed, by our law having been taken from them by the interference of our authorities, the Government acknowledged their right to compensation; but that in regard to the *Enterprise* the case was different—that when she came to Bermuda slavery was abolished, and no man, whether English, American, or of any other nation, could plead lawfully the possession of slaves in British territory—that the slaves who were unlawfully held on board that vessel had been taken, not by an improper interference, but by a proper interference on the part of the colonial authorities, and that there was no claim whatever for compensation. But they not only refused compensation in the case of the *Enterprise*, but said in effect, "Mark you well, that in any other case in which an American vessel, holding slaves on board, shall be driven by stress of weather into a British port, if you lose your slaves we will give no compensation, because no wrong is done." And had the Government given that opinion upon its own responsibility? No. The point had been carefully and maturely considered by the law advisers of the Crown, and in the report which they made they said, with reference to the case of the *Enterprise*—slavery being then abolished in the British empire, slaves were human beings (a fact which some of our plenipotentiaries seemed to have forgotten), and that they had a right to be heard before their fate was decided upon; that when slaves came to a country where slavery was unknown and forbidden, they were to be regarded as aliens, who had been always free, and could no more be claimed by their master than by a stranger; that if they were given up they were aggrieved, and would be entitled to sue for damages; that where slavery was abolished, slaves were liberated according to the municipal law, and no wrong being done, there was no claim for compensation; and that slavery being abolished in the British empire, there was no claim for compensation in respect of the slaves aboard the *Enterprise*, when she came into a British colony. Lord Ashburton had not taken that view of the matter, but said, in his correspondence with Mr. Webster, that the object of the British Government was to look to measures for the future prevention of such occurrences—those occurrences being the prevention of the liberation of American slaves; that that object could be attained he had little doubt, although both parties might not immediately agree as to the precise means by which it was to be effected, but that he had great confidence that it might be effectually done; that at the same time that we maintained our own laws, as administered in our own territory, we were bound to respect the laws of other nations within their territories, and to listen to every suggestion to remove any existing annoyance. Then Lord Ashburton said that meanwhile he would engage, on the part of his Government, that information should be sent to the Governors of our colonies on the southern borders of the United States to execute their own laws with careful attention to the wish of the Government to maintain good neighbourhood, and that no officious interference should be practised towards American vessels which should be driven by accident or by unlawful violence into British ports; that the laws of hospitality should be observed, and that these laws seemed neither to justify nor to require further inquiry into persons or things on board vessels in such a situation than was indispensable to enforce the observance of the municipal law of the colony. (Cheers from the ministerial side.) Well, Mr. Webster accepted this as meaning that the colonial authorities were to be instructed not to meddle unnecessarily with persons or things on board American vessels driven into British ports by stress of weather; but was Lord Ashburton not aware of the force of the words he used? He thought they bore a different construction from that in which the Americans received them, and that if the words were taken in the sense in which they ought to be construed, they amounted to a refusal; and he said that Lord Ashburton ought to have used language which would have explained the grounds of his refusal. Why he wrote a mere quibble, according to the cheers which had just proceeded from the other side of the house, for what did that cheer mean? It meant that the gentlemen opposite would say that the municipal laws of the colony entitled slaves to their freedom; but he said, that if Lord Ashburton meant to cover that meaning under these words—if he intended to convey to Mr. Webster one meaning by sheltering himself under another, that was not answering as a British plenipotentiary ought to answer. But he thought that was the meaning of the words, and he hoped that it was the meaning which the gentlemen opposite would attribute to them, and that they would say they did not

intend to send instructions to prevent what the Americans called the "officious interference" of the colonial authorities. He trusted that orders would be sent to the authorities to exercise that officious interference in the case of all negroes entering a British port, and thus entitled to hospitality and protection against the owners of the vessels. He trusted it would never be permitted that great numbers of persons should, within British jurisdiction, be held in illegal confinement, without the interposition of the British authorities to give them the freedom to which they were entitled. The Americans ought to be made to feel, that with respect to slaves on board American vessels in British ports, the owners were just in the same situation as if the vessels had foundered at sea, with this only difference, that instead of some hundreds of human beings having met their death amid the waves of the ocean, some hundreds would have received a new life, as he might say, by being admitted to the privileges and blessings of civilization. He trusted he should hear, that whatever construction the Government put upon Lord Ashburton's words, they had no intention of entering into such an argument as Mr. Webster expected at their hands, but that they would firmly and boldly take their ground upon the same principle which the late Government had laid down, without reservation, in the case of the ship *Enterprise*.

Sir R. PEEL said,—I shall not follow the noble lord in the order of his subject, but take, first, that part of the negotiations relative to the suppression of the slave-trade, in respect to which he accuses my noble friend and the Government of having taken a backward course. He tells us that by the insertion of the second article in the treaty, America was bound to do all that had been required by the treaty of Vienna. What has the noble lord, during the ten years he was at the head of the Foreign department, done to give effect to or enforce the treaty of Ghent? Has he obtained the recognition of the right of search with respect to vessels under the flag of the United States? Now, since the year 1842, America has entered into a stipulation to equip a large squadron to put down, jointly with us, the slave-trade, and prevent her flag being fraudulently used to cover that traffic. The second point raised by the noble lord to show that we have retrograded, consisted in a charge made against us of having occasioned France to refuse her ratification of the treaty admitting the right of search. But no, it was not our act that effected this; it was the act of the noble lord himself; who, by his conduct in respect to the operations on the coast of Syria, excited the open hostility of the Government and people of France against this country. (Loud cheers.) Why was not this assumed as a ground of censure last session? As to the objections taken in reference to the order issued to our ships of war by his noble friend the Foreign Secretary, it was only necessary to observe that, however desirous we should be to put down the inhuman traffic, our cruisers ought to be instructed not to violate the laws of nations in their attempts to do so. This was in perfect accordance with the opinion delivered by the Queen's advocate, that going on shore, or into ports on the coasts of friendly nations, in pursuit of suspected vessels, was not warranted by law. If the law of nations were, in pursuit of this object, violated, then will arise the question of compensation, independently of its being certainly very desirable that the suppression of the trade should be accomplished by such means alone as are legal. Use all your naval force, if you will, for this object; but, in enforcing respect for the principles of humanity, let us not lose sight of the great principles of law which govern all civilized nations. These are the only observations which I feel it necessary to make upon this part of the case, in defence of my noble friend, although it be not strictly connected with the question under discussion. The next point was the extradition of persons charged with the commission of offences; and, in point of fact, the noble lord admitted that the general object attempted to be accomplished by that article of the treaty was a wise one in respect to countries whose boundaries were coterminous; and that to permit the escape of criminals by stepping over that boundary was prejudicial to good order, and injurious to the interests of both countries; and that if we could provide, in the case of aggravated offences, for the reciprocal delivery of heinous criminals, that was an object of great importance to civilized governments. (Hear.) I admit, on the other hand, with the noble lord, that we are bound to take great care that, in the application of this principle, we do not interfere with the rights of men who may have become freemen by stepping upon our soil. The execution, however, of this principle, must be provided for by law. There is nothing in the treaty which can be carried into effect except by the consent of Parliament. A bill on the subject must be introduced, and the proper course will be to postpone the consideration of the details of that measure until it shall be before us for discussion. (Hear, hear.) But there is a special provision as to that 10th article of the treaty, that even though a bill should be brought in and passed, nevertheless, if experience should show that we cannot reconcile the two objects of preventing the escape of criminals on the one hand, and of consulting on the other the rights and interests of those unfortunate persons who in one country are held in slavery, but who become instantly free on stepping across the boundary into the neighbouring country,—then there is a provision as to the duration of that act, that on the expression of the wish of either party to that effect it shall cease to exist. (Hear.) This is a most important provision, because it enables us to profit by experience; for if the law should be found to be prejudicial in its operation, we have the right to say to the Government of the United States, we object to its longer continuance, and it will at once cease. Now, sir, with respect to another point,—the correspondence which took place upon the subject of the *Creole*. The noble lord must, in the first place, be aware that no stipulations were entered into by Lord Ashburton on the subject of the *Creole*; but, throughout the negotiations, Lord Ashburton expresses a wish to reserve, for the consideration of his Government at home, the arrangements which it might be desirable to make in respect to cases similar to that of the *Creole*. Lord Ashburton "declines to enter into any stipulations; but thinks, for the reasons already stated, that this question had better be settled in London," where it might be discussed and decided with more satisfaction to both countries. But, in referring to the question of the *Creole*, Lord Ashburton lays down this great principle:—"On the great principles affecting this case we do not differ. We both admit, that if a slave, the property of an American citizen, come into the British territory, it is not expected by you that he should be restored; and, on the other hand, we do not invite slaves to come to our shores from the United States, or that British possessions should be used for the purpose of violating the municipal laws of

a friendly nation; but when they come to our shores there is no alternative—they are then free." (Hear, hear.) The British law, in this respect, is too well known to require repetition; and it is, in fact, the same with that of every part of the United States in which slavery is not recognised. Then a question was raised as to those countries bordering on the United States; and Lord Ashburton contends that the English municipal law in respect to slaves is immediate in its operation, and that he was a slave yesterday is entitled to the same privilege as he who was free from his birth. And upon that point there can, I think, be no question. (Hear.) Again; the position of the Bahamas, it was contended, made the question somewhat different. Lord Ashburton said there was a strong feeling on the subject in the southern states; but he refused to enter into any arrangement upon the subject. Compensation was asked for the owners of those slaves who had obtained their liberty on touching the Bahamas; and in answer to that demand, Her Majesty's Government said that the slaves were entitled to their liberty, and we could not give any compensation. That is the principle on which, I believe, this country, and every other country not recognising slavery under its municipal laws, must act when compensation is demanded for loss sustained on account of the escape of a slave from his master.

Mr. MACAULAY observed,—But the second question with respect to this treaty is, has it settled all the points in dispute between the two countries? Has it not rather left them in a worse situation than before? I shall not at this hour of the night go into the whole of this part of the subject; but one point I will state, on which I think that we are placed by this treaty in a worse situation than before—I mean the right of visit, that right on which public feeling is so strong among the people of the United States, that right which this country, as the right hon. baronet has stated, is determined not to abandon. Now I ask the members of Her Majesty's Government who sit opposite, what is the sense in which they understand this 8th article of the treaty, in which "the parties mutually stipulate that each shall prepare, equip, and maintain in service, on the coast of Africa, a sufficient and adequate squadron or naval force of vessels of suitable numbers and descriptions, to carry in all not less than 80 guns, to enforce separately and respectively the laws, rights, and obligations of each of the two countries for the suppression of the slave-trade; the said squadrons to be independent of each other, but the two Governments stipulating, nevertheless, to give such orders to the officers commanding their respective forces as shall enable them most effectually to act in concert and co-operation, upon mutual consultation, as exigencies may arise, for the attainment of the true object of this article, copies of such orders to be communicated by each Government to the other respectively?" Does that mean that we have ceded the right of visit or not? (Cheers.) The right hon. baronet said distinctly that it did not. But in what sense has it been ratified by the United States? The right hon. baronet made some exception to the report of the committee of the Senate of the United States, because, he said, the President only constituted the Executive to the Government of that country. But I suppose gentlemen are generally aware that by the constitution of the United States the Senate must ratify all treaties entered into with foreign powers before they have validity there. Now, I hold in my hand the report of Mr. Rives, the senator for Virginia. Mr. Rives was chairman of the committee of foreign relations to whom the treaty was referred; the committee directed him to report to the Senate, and on this report the treaty was ratified by that body; therefore there can hardly be a stronger proof of the sense in which the treaty was ratified by the Senate of the United States than the report from which I am about to quote. Mr. Rives there said that, under that article each country was to act separately and independently of the other, neither being permitted to visit or search the vessels of the other. (Hear, hear.) Now, my assertion is, that this 8th article is so much waste paper. I say that it was ratified in London in one sense, and at Washington in another. (Hear, hear.) The right hon. baronet will support me when I say that by the stipulation for a squadron "to enforce separately and respectively the laws, rights, and obligations of each of the two countries, for the suppression of the slave-trade," it was not intended to give up the right of visit. But what is the construction of these words in America? The Senate of the United States gave its assent to the treaty upon a report containing these words, "Each power will act independently, and will exercise a police over its own vessels, neither being permitted to visit or search the vessels of the other." Now, I wish to know whether it ever before was known that when our ambassador was sent from this country to effect a treaty with a foreign country which should establish relations of amity on a firm basis, he should frame an article of the treaty which within a week should be ratified in the one country in one sense, and in the other afterwards in another sense? The understanding in Washington was, that the right of search was completely abandoned by Great Britain, whilst the understanding in this country was that we had not abandoned or compromised one single tittle upon this point. (Hear, hear.) Now, if the question were one upon which it would take four or five years before the opposite constructions would bring the two nations into conflict, the defect would not be so glaring; but one of the articles in the treaty contains a distinct provision exactly calculated to bring the question to an early and decisive issue. It is provided, that the two powers who are parties to the treaty shall send out a squadron each to act in concert; and how is this concerted action provided for? Why, in the strangest manner possible; for one squadron goes out with instructions from its Government that the right of search is to be enforced, and the other has instructions that it has been altogether abandoned by Great Britain. (Cheers.) Was there ever a more ingenious mode devised to bring these squadrons into collision? (Renewed cheers.) Could anything better calculated to produce such a result be by possibility conceived, than to send out two sets of men, ardent themselves, and commanded by high-spirited officers, with two different sets of instructions, calculated to inflame and provoke the national feelings of both? (Cheers.) Such, then, must be the result of a treaty which it was to be presumed had been elaborately drawn with a view to insure the continuance of peace between the two countries, but which, instead of producing that effect, is calculated to destroy in a very short period all our pacific relations with the United States. (Hear, hear.) I must observe upon a curious fact relating to this article, so strangely framed

as to present such opposite interpretations,—that we have not in the papers a single line of explanation or correspondence relative to it, and it all appears to have been effected by conversation alone. (Hear, hear.) What must be the supposition—for it is left to supposition alone—what must be the supposition respecting it? Must we suppose that Lord Ashburton, conversing with Mr. Webster in that soft caressing style which characterizes all his correspondence, gave Mr. Webster reason to believe that the right of search was given up by this country? (Cheers.) The right hon. baronet at the head of the Government tells us that the right was not abandoned, and I accept the right hon. gentleman's assertion as to the fact. But, then, there yet remains the other horn of the dilemma. How was it that Mr. Webster and the Senate of the United States were induced to come to the conclusion that it had been given up? (Cheers.) How was it that Mr. Rives, the chairman of the committee of the Senate, appointed to ratify all that was done with respect to foreign affairs—a committee which had all the secret papers, which was in full possession of the whole of the transactions, which deliberated with closed door,—and which carefully investigated all that related to the treaty, how was it that Mr. Rives and the committee should remain under the impression that the right had been abandoned? (Cheers.) Look, then, again at the speech of the President, and see how he conceived the article, notwithstanding that the right hon. baronet opposite assures us that nothing which Lord Ashburton did could lead to the supposition that this country was inclined to waive the right of visit. (Hear, hear.) I will not use hard words, but I must ask, can I attribute all this to mere misapprehension on the part of the authorities of the United States? (Cheers.) Perhaps the better way would be to say that the speech of Lord Ashburton answered himself, as I have often seen that it has done when he was speaking on the floor of this house, and that the noble lord did not well weigh his words before he delivered them; but then what has been said by the right hon. baronet opposite negatives that supposition. (Cheers.) What am I to do in these conflicting interpretations, when the Government of the United States, before the ink is yet dry upon the treaty, interprets it one way, and the Government of this country gives it a different interpretation? (Cheers.) The first proof which we have of this is, that we find the Prime Minister of England give a direct contradiction to the interpretation put upon the treaty in the message of the American President. Does this show that it is anything but calculated to promote amicable relations between the two countries?

British India.

COOLIE EMIGRATION.—The despatch of Coolies to the Mauritius has commenced under the operation of the Act; and it is reported that arrangements are in progress for sending six or seven thousand thither before the close of the present monsoon. The nature of these arrangements has not been recorded by any of our contemporaries; and the public is, therefore, without the means of comparing the new system of emigration with that which was put down by law, or of determining how far it is likely to be effectual in permanently checking the growth of abuses. We learn that the Coolies are engaged, as they were under the whole system, by mercantile firms in Calcutta, and that the vessels employed in transporting the labourers are chartered by them. It is desirable to know what motives could induce houses of business in Calcutta to give up their time to the gratuitous promotion of the system. One of the first vessels employed in conveying labourers has been detected in a nefarious attempt to violate the law, and to embark a greater number than the Act permits. It is somewhat singular that a procedure which fixes so deep a moral stigma on all who were engaged in it, should not have been repudiated by the commander of the vessel, or the house of agency by which the vessel was chartered. If the attempt to smuggle these additional labourers was made without the cognizance of the captain and the consigners of the vessel, a sense of honour should have led them to explain a circumstance so discreditable. If the attempt was made—which we can scarcely credit—with their knowledge, we have clear evidence of the kind of morality which this system is calculated to foster.—*Friend of India, Jan. 20.*

DRAFT OF THE PROPOSED ACT FOR THE ABOLITION OF SLAVERY.—We are as ardent in the cause of abolition, total and eternal abolition,—we are as steadfast advocates of the rights of man—as deep haters of slavery and oppression, as any human creature living. We are no short-comers, no admirers of make-shifts; but we never, for the sake of the mere glitter of general principles, however dazzling in themselves, forget the practical adaptation of means to an end, which it is the duty of every philanthropist to study. We look to the advancement of our fellow-men, the improvement of their social condition, the increase of their happiness, the elevation of their morals; and in doing so we not only regard what they ought to be but what they are. Now, looking at this recent enactment, relating to slavery in the East Indies, we are constrained to say, that though there is outwardly no recognition of any grand principle, that though slavery itself is not, *totidem verbis*, declared to be extinct, and the trafficking in human flesh pronounced penal, a law is proposed, which will, in effect, if not totally abolish slavery, abolish all slavery which is not of a voluntary and self-imposed character. Not only has the slave-owner no right over the person of his slave, either to punish or to coerce, to strike or to imprison, but he is declared legally to have no property in his slave, and no right over the property of his slave. A man cannot be said to be a slave who may walk off his reputed master's estate and defy his authority. Possessed of all the rights and all the protection of freemen, where is his slavery, where is his degradation? As for buying and selling, who will buy, knowing that he can have no property in what he buys?—that the law will not recognise the transaction? But it may be said, it is all very well to talk about remedy and protection, where are they? It is a mockery to tell a man that he has his remedy when the remedy to him is as unattainable as though it were not in existence. Now, granting this, we ask if it is not equally applicable to the case of any sort of protection afforded to any sort of men, in countries where justice is as rare as it is in India. A poor and a weak man will always find difficulty in obtaining justice against the rich and the powerful; but slavery, under the provisions of the new Act, does not aggravate these difficulties. A master may beat or confine, or possess himself of the property of a free labourer; and neither is the Act more penal, nor the chances of impunity less, than if he had

beaten or confined, or possessed himself of the property of a slave. In our opinion, the new Act will sweep away all the evils of slavery, by placing the slave, in every respect essential to his safety and happiness, on a level with the free man. The name only remains; and there may be considerations rendering it unadvisable to make war upon this name.—*Abridged from the Bengal Hurkaru.*

Foreign Intelligence.

BRAZIL.—A correspondent has transmitted to us the following report of a project brought before the House of Deputies at Rio-de Janeiro by Senhor Antonio Pereira Riboncas, Deputy for Bahia.

"Palace of the Deputies, Rio, 7th January, 1843.

"All Brazil knows, and I believe is convinced of it, that we have as yet drawn no advantage from European immigration: those who have tried to bring about this desideratum have reaped but miserable fruits from it; and therefore we must try to find a means which will be not only a change from slave labour to free European labour, but also a remedy for the painful situation in which we are, owing to the abolition of slave labour without the necessary preliminary measures. I am of opinion that the remedy for this is in admitting Africans as colonists, with all the necessary precautions, so that not only agriculture may not suffer, as it now does, through the importation of slaves by contraband, the price of which is too high to leave a profit on their employment, but also that Brazil may not have any longer to suffer what it is now exposed to through the slave-trade. To render the admission of Africans as colonists practicable among us, we have only to revoke article 7th of the law of the 13th September, 1830.

"This is as conformable to our interests and to our institutions as to the international law. According to the instructions of 1807, it is the attribute of the Brazilian and British nations conjointly to grant freedom to the prize Africans, and to employ them as colonists in their respective countries: that England now does in Sierra Leone, and that we can still much better do in our own country (at home.) All that is wanted is only the permission to go to the ports of Africa, and there to exchange our goods for Africans, who are there held in captivity and sold as goods, and to make them free before we embark them; and to employ them in our service. This is of evident advantage to Brazil, not only for its agriculture, but also for the increase of its produce.

"Indeed, owing to the discontinuation of the slave-trade, which, under pretext of its illegality, is prohibited in a manner contrary to reason, to the laws, and to international rights, our sugar-houses, our distilleries, and our tobacco plantations, whose consumers were mostly Africans, are falling to ruin; the revenue which formerly was thus yielded is almost nought; and even the customs are losing the duties which the Africans, as consumers, had to pay to them, and which now they pay to the Europeans, who bring to them direct such goods. To remedy all these evils, I propose the following project of law:—

"The General Legislative Assembly decrees—

"Art. 1. Article 7th of the law of the 13th September, 1830, is revoked, and the law of the 11th October, 1837, is henceforth to be applied to all born Africans.

"Art. 2. No African will be received on board of any vessel which is to carry him to Brazil as a colonist, without having first had delivered to him his brief of freedom, as laid down in article 7th of the instructions of 28th July, 1817.

"Art. 3. Government will establish the requisite regulations for the carrying out of this law, as well concerning the inviolability of the liberty of the colonists in conformity with the preceding article, and the manner of their importation according to the alvara of the 14th October, 1813; as also respecting the equitableness of the contracts, in such a manner that the respective obligations be not excessively onerous, taking for its base the outlays for purchase with the interest.

"Art. 4. All laws to the contrary are without effect."—*Colonial Gazette, March 29th.*

DONATIONS AND SUBSCRIPTIONS.

The following contributions have been received during the past month, and are hereby gratefully acknowledged:—

	Donations.	Subs.
Cheltenham, Ladies' Anti-Slavery Association.....	£12 18 0	
Less expenses, applied locally..	1 18 0	
	11 0 0	
Agnew, Miss	—	1 1 0
Aldridge, Miss	—	0 5 0
Ball, Mrs.	—	1 0 0
Banner, Mrs.	—	0 10 0
Burrows, Mrs.	—	0 10 0
Capper, Mrs.	—	1 1 0
Clutterbuck, Miss	—	1 0 0
Gardner, Mrs.	—	1 0 0
Newman, Mrs.	—	1 0 0
Ormsby, Mrs.	—	0 10 0
Owen, Mrs.	—	1 0 0
Reynell, Mrs. (Leamington).....	—	1 0 0
Savage, Mr.	—	0 10 0
Seward, Miss (Leamington).....	—	0 10 0
Wallace, Mrs.	—	0 10 0
Underwood, Mrs.	—	0 10 0
Yerbury, Miss	—	1 1 0
Newcastle-on-Tyne Emancipation Society	10 0 0	
Cirencester Auxiliary.....	2 0 0	
London, Gurney, Samuel, Lombard-street	50 0 0	
Tottenham, Howard, Luke	—	5 0 0
Areley, Zachary, Thomas	3 0 0	
Strood, Wheeler, Frederick	—	1 0 0

Printed by WILLIAM TYLER and CHARLES REED, of No. 5, Bolt Court, in the Parish of St. Dunstan, and City of London: and Published by LANCELOT WILDE, of 13, Catherine-street, Strand, in the Parish of St. Mary-le-Strand, and City of Westminster, at 13, Catherine-street, Strand, as aforesaid. Sold by W. EVERETT, 6, Finch-lane, Cornhill. April 5th, 1843.